

REMARKS

In this paper, claims 1, 4-7, 11 and 17 are currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 1-20 are pending.

An Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) accompanies this amendment. If the IDS is not in the PTO file when the examiner considers this amendment, the examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned so that a duplicate copy may be provided.

The applicant appreciates the indicated allowability of claims 11, 12 and 17-20 if rewritten to be in independent form. Claims 11 and 17 have been rewritten to be in independent form, so it is believed that claims 11, 12 and 17-20 are now allowable.

Claims 1-6, 7, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ikuma, et al (US 5,664,636). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.


Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a voltage decreasing unit decreases voltage of the battery unit when the bicycle condition detecting unit detects the selected condition. Ikuma, et al discloses a bicycle (11) with an electric motor (36) used to assist pedaling. Motor (36) is powered from a pair of rechargeable batteries (39) that supply power through a main switch (43) to a controller (44). Controller (44) includes a stop discrimination control section (51) that operates so as to discontinue power assist under certain conditions, such as when the bicycle is stopped and a pedal force is less than a given value. However, power to motor (36) is not shut off abruptly when these conditions are detected. Instead, the motor output is gradually decreased to zero. While current may be drawn from batteries (39) during this time, Ikuma, et al neither disclose nor suggest decreasing voltage of the battery unit when the detecting unit detects the selected condition. Also, since current may be drawn for some time before it affects battery voltage, the operation of the Ikuma, et al device does not inherently decrease battery voltage when the selected condition is detected.

Claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikuma, et al in view of Dougherty, et al (US 6,452,361). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons noted above.

Claims 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikuma, et al in view of Ligman (US 6,588,528). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons noted above. Furthermore, there is no evidence that the Ligman resistor would in fact provide any benefit to the Ikuma, et al device.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102, §103 and §112 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland  
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE  
P.O. Box 69  
Klamath River, California 96050  
(530) 465-2430